## Message

From: Subramaniam, Ravi [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP

(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=E738F9D27062486E9047184B867FD968-SUBRAMANIAM, RAVI)

Sent: 1/20/2015 3:00:26 PM
To: tbstarr@mindspring.com

**Subject**: RE: some loose ends on formaldehyde

## Tom:

Yes, I have been extremely busy with my new management position. It has been a while so I need to set aside some time to see where the discrepancy comes from. I have it on my task list for today. I will try to call you tomorrow.

--Ravi.

Acting Branch Chief, Quantitative Risk Methods Group, NCEA-Washington, ORD, EPA *Potomac Yard North N7761, Arlington, VA.* **(703) 347-8606, (571) 305-3601 (m)** 

From: tbstarr@mindspring.com [mailto:tbstarr@mindspring.com]

Sent: Tuesday, January 20, 2015 9:41 AM

To: Subramaniam, Ravi

Subject: Fwd: some loose ends on formaldehyde

## Ravi:

Any progress on resolving the discrepancies I noted in my previous 12/26/2014 email re formaldehyde tumor data (see below)? I know you are very busy, but I was hoping to complete a report on use of the DNA adduct data for risk assessment in combination with the rat nasal tumor data, and I need an answer re the correct background nasal tumor incidence. Please call me (919/876-0203) if you have any questions. Thanks very much in advance.

Best regards, Tom Starr

TBS Associates 7500 Rainwater Road Raleigh NC 27615-3700 USA 919/876-0203 tbstarr@mindspring.com

----- Forwarded Message ------

**Subject:** some loose ends on formaldehyde **Date:** Fri, 26 Dec 2014 19:21:26 -0500

From:tbstarr@mindspring.com

To:subramaniam, Ravi <Subramaniam.Ravi@epa.gov>

## Ravi:

I was doing some additional formaldehyde risk calculations for rats recently, and noticed a couple of discrepancies in a write-up that you sent to me way back in 2012, 11/5/2012 to be exact. They pertain to the background squamous cell carcinoma incidence that you used in your model

fitting and subsequent calculations.

In the table in your 11/5/2012 writeup, background nasal cancer incidence is listed as 1/3602, but it is also listed as 0.0008. However, both of these numbers, which are not equal, appear to me to be incorrect.

First, 1/3602 = 2.78e-4, not 0.0008. Second, your 2007 Risk Analysis 27(5):1237-1254 paper lists the background squamous cell carcinoma incidence as 1/4602 = 0.02% or 0.0002. I presume the latter number (1/4602) is the correct one. Can you please confirm this via return email at your earliest convenience? Thanks very much.

Best regards and happy holidays, Tom Starr

TBS Associates 7500 Rainwater Road Raleigh NC 27615-3700 USA 919/876-0203 tbstarr@mindspring.com